

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his tentative agreement to permit the addition of a new set of computer program product claims corresponding to the allowed method claims, about which Applicants inquired by telephone on September 14, 2005. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for his suggestion to incorporate the new claims in this § 1.312 amendment, which was otherwise being filed to correct a typographical error.

In response to the Notice of Allowance dated July 5, 2005, Applicants have amended claim 26 to correct the typographical error. No new matter is introduced in the amendment.

New claims 27-31 directed to a computer program product correspond to the allowed method claims. The new claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons that the method claims were allowed. Support for the new claims can be found in the specification, for example at page 2, lines 21-29, at page 3, lines 10-19, and in the originally filed claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants hereby specifically reserve the right to prosecute claims of different or broader scope in a continuation or divisional application.

Applicants note that any claim amendments made herein are made solely for the purposes of more clearly and particularly describing and claiming the invention, and not for purposes of overcoming art or for patentability or narrowing the claims.

As to any response filed in this application, the Examiner should infer no (i) adoption of a position with respect to patentability, (ii) change in the Applicants' position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or (iii) acquiescence in any way to any position taken by the Examiner, based on such amendments. It is believed that all rejections, issues and comments were addressed throughout prosecution of these claims. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment in the prosecution file does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because arguments that were made during prosecution may not have been exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of

Applicant : Steve Pellegrin et al.
Serial No. : 09/808,533
Filed : March 14, 2001
Page : 6

Attorney's Docket No. 07844-445001

previously pending claims (or other claims) that were not expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper or in previous papers should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated, and the amendment of any currently pending or previously pending claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is an issue fee transmittal, along with the required fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/16/05

/Greg H. Gardella/
Greg H. Gardella
Reg. No. 46,045
I hereby certify that the electronic signature affixed to this document is my own

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696